DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 224 064 CS 504 042

AUTHOR Remland, Martin; And Others
TITLE Effects of Psychological Gender and Sex-Incongruent Behavior on Evaluations of Leadership.
PUB DATE [82]
NOTE 14p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Androgyny; Behavior Patterns; *Communication Research; Females; Higher Education; *Leadership; Males; *Nonverbal Communication; Organizational Communication; *Personality Traits; Role Perception; *Sex Bias; Sex Differences; *Sex Stereotypes

ABSTRACT

A study investigated the effect of the psychological gender of the perceiver on evaluations of leadership performance of a male and a female manager engaging in either supportive or nonsupportive nonverbal communication with a male subordinate. Subjects were 139 male and 150 female undergraduates who had completed a personal attributes questionnaire several weeks prior to the experiment. Based on their psychological gender classification (sex-typed masculine or feminine, androgynous, and undifferentiated), subjects were randomly assigned to one of six experimental conditions in which a manager (male or female) interacted with a male subordinate about a production-oriented problem followed by a people-oriented problem so that his or her nonverbal communication behavior was either (1) supportive during the discussion of both problems, (2) nonsupportive for the production problem but supportive for the people problem, or (3) nonsupportive for both discussions. Analysis of results indicated that judgments about leadership were not affected by an interaction between the psychological gender of the subject and the sex-incongruent behavior of the managers. These findings conflict with earlier findings of sex-role stereotyping in various organizational contexts, perhaps because of the design of the experiment. These results do, however, provide qualified support for the prediction that supportive behavior is perceived as more considerate than nonsupportive behavior. (JL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED224064

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

EFFECTS OF PSYCHOLOGICAL GENDER AND SEX-INCONGRUENT BEHAVIOR ON EVALUATIONS OF LEADERSHIP

Martin Remland, Carolyn Jacobson, and Tricia Jones

Ohio University
Athens, Ohio

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Martin Remland
Carolyn Jacobson
Tricia Jones

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS504062

Research on person perception in organizational contexts indicates that individuals tend to be judged unfavorably when their behavior violates sex-role norms (Rosen & Jerdee, 1973; Bartol & Butterfield, 1976; Terborg & Ilgen, 1977; Haccoun, Haccoun, & Sallay, 1978; Mai-Dalton, Feldman-Summers, & Mitchell, 1979). Sex-role expectations for males include behavior described as aggressive, independent, objective, dominant, logical, active, ambitious, adventurous, self-confident, and competitive. In contrast females are expected to be talkative, tasteful, gentle, neat, quiet, illogical, emotional, sensitive, and passive (Welsh, 1979). Kanter (1977) observes that women in business are expected to demonstrate subjectivity and dependence, while men's expected behavior is tough-minded and analytic.

Eakins and Eakins (1978) report sex differences in various non-verbal communicative behaviors which reinforce the cultural stereotype of supportive females (warm, caring, and expressive) and nonsupportive males (cold, uncaring, and unexpressive). Females enact behaviors that are more attentive (i.e., eye contact, direct body orientation, and forward lean), more reinforcing (i.e. head nods and mhmm's), and more expressive (i.e., facial and vocal displays of emotion) than males.

An important mediating variable in sex-role-related person perception research is the psychological gender of the perceiver. The concept of androgyny views masculine and feminine attributes as separate and essentially orthogonal dimensions rather than bipolar

opposites on a single continuum (Spence & Helmreich, 1978). Recent findings indicate that androgynous persons are less likely than their sex-typed counterparts to form a negative impression of sex-incongruent behavior (Collins, Waters, & Waters, 1979; Sharp & Post, 1980).

This study investigated the effect of psychological gender on evaluations of leadership performance of a male and a female manager engaging in either supportive or nonsupportive nonverbal communication with a male subordinate. It was hypothesized that psychological gender would interact with the manager's sex and nonverbal communication such that androgynous individuals would judge a manager's non-traditional behavior (supportive male and nonsupportive female) less negatively than would sex-typed (masculine and feminine) individuals. Also, since supportive nonverbal behaviors tend to be associated with attributions of empathy and respect (Tepper & Haase, 1978), it was expected that supportive nonverbal cues would be judged as more considerate than nonsupportive nonverbal cues.

METHOD

Subjects

Subjects were 139 male and 150 female undergraduates enrolled in a multi-section basic communication course. All subjects received extra credit for their participation in the experiment.

Procedures

Several weeks prior to the experiment, subjects completed the Personal Attributes Questionnaire developed by Spence, Helmreich and Stapp (1974) to measure an individual's psychological gender

orientation. The 24-item version was given. Spence and Helmreich (1978) report reliability coefficients of .85, .82, and .78 for the masculinity, femininity, and masculinity-femininity subscales respectively.

Based on their psychological gender classification (sex-typed masculine or feminine, androgynous, and undifferentiated) subjects were randomly assigned to one of six experimental conditions. The six conditions were different versions of a written scenario in which a manager (male or female) interacted with a male subordinate about a production-oriented problem (how to improve productivity in the plant) followed by a people-oriented problem (how the subordinate might cope with a disturbing family conflict). Behaviors were embedded in the scenario so that the manager's nonverbal communication would be portrayed as either supportive (leaning forward, touching the subordinate, speaking in a soft voice, smiling sympathetically, gazing, and nodding) or nonsupportive (leaning back, keeping distance, speaking in a firm voice, refusing to smile, interrupting, looking away, and turning away). Subjects were given scenarios in which the manager was either (1) supportive during both the production and people-oriented problem discussion (SS), (2) nonsupportive during the production-oriented problem discussion and supportive during the people-oriented problem discussion (NS), or (3) nonsupportive during both the production- and people-oriented problem discussions (NN). The verbal communication of the manager was the same in each version of the scenario.

After reading the scenario, subjects completed a leadership rating form of 18 seven-point bipolar scale items which measure a task and a consideration dimension of a supervisor's performance in a given situation (Remland, 1981). Coefficient alpha for the task factor was .75, and .91 for the consideration factor. Factor loadings are reported in Table 1.

INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

RESULTS

The first hypothesis was not supported by the data. Multivariate analysis of varience yielded nonsignificant interactions among the independent variables. Judgments about leadership were not affected by an interaction between the psychological gender of the subject and the sex-incongruent behavior of the managers.

A main effect was found for the manager's nonverbal communication ($F\ 4, 538 = 29.74$, $p < .0001$) and for the sex of the subject ($F\ 2, 269 = 6.03$, $p < .002$). Analysis of variance for the manager's nonverbal communication indicated that consideration ratings were affected ($F\ 2, 285 = 71.50$, $p < .0001$) as well as the task ratings ($F\ 2, 285 = 20.61$, $p < .0001$).

INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

Subsequent mean comparisons using Dunn's procedure showed that the manager was perceived as more considerate ($t = 11,3$, $p < .01$) in the

($\bar{X}$ = 34.7) version than in the NN ($\bar{X}$ = 20.7) version. The NS version ($\bar{X}$ = 32.9) was also rated as more considerate ($t = 10.0$, $p < .01$) than the NN version. The SS and NS versions were not significantly different ($t = 1.6$, $p > .01$). Similarly, the manager was perceived as more task-oriented ($t = 3.3$, $p < .01$) in the SS version ($\bar{X}$ = 21.2) than in the NN version ($\bar{X}$ = 17.2). The NS version ($\bar{X}$ = 20.9) was also perceived as more task-orineted than the NN version ($t = 3.0$, $p < .01$). The SS and NS versions did not elicit differential perceptions of task-oriented leadership ($t = .30$, $p > .01$).

A main effect for the sex of the subject indicated that males ($\bar{X}$ = 31.6) rated tha manager as more considerate ($F\ 1, 285 = 11.75$, $p < .0007$) than females ($\bar{X}$ = 28.4). There was no significant main effect for manager's sex.

The manager's nonverbal communication accounted for approximately 32% of the variance in consideration ratings; the sex of the subject accounted for only 4% of the variance. The manager's nonverbal communication explained 13% of the variance in perceptions of task-oriented leadership.

INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

DISCUSSION

The results of this study do not support earlier findings of sex-role stereotyping in various organizational contexts. Judgments of nontraditional sex-role behavior exhibited by male and female managers were not affected by the psychological gender of the judges.

This runs counter to some recent investigations (Collins, Waters, & Waters, 1979; Sharp & Post, 1980) showing that persons with conventional sex-role orientations were more likely to discriminate against sex-incongruent behavior.

Several explanations for this apparent inconsistency seem plausible. First, subjects may not have perceived the supportive or non-supportive behaviors used by the manager as sex-incongruent in the particular context of the scenario employed in this study. Future research should investigate the influence of various contexts on perceptions of traditional and nontraditional behavior. Second, although perceptions of leadership were not affected, other evaluative judgments not measured in this experiment might nonetheless have been influenced by sex-role stereotyping. Third, the use of a written scenario in which nonverbal communication was described rather than pictured, may have inhibited the reactions that might have occurred in response to actual nonverbal cues.

The results of this study provide qualified support for the prediction that supportive behavior would be perceived as more considerate than nonsupportive behavior. The finding that managers were not viewed as more considerate in the SS condition than in the NS condition suggests an "interaction effect" between supportive behavior and context which should be further explored. Specifically, the manager was seen as more considerate when supportive behavior was used during just the people-oriented problem (NS) or during both the people-oriented and production-oriented problem (SS) than when supportive behavior was not used (NN). However, the use of supportive behavior during both problem discussions

(SS) was not perceived as more considerate than the use of supportive behaviors during the people-oriented problem discussion alone (NS). The implication is that perceptions of supportive behavior as considerate appear to depend on the type of problem being addressed.

A similar relationship was found between the manager's supportive behavior and the task behavior ratings of the subjects. This appears to suggest that the use of supportive behavior by the manager in the particular context of the interview led to more favorable judgments of leadership performance overall.

The finding that the manager was rated as more considerate by male subjects than by female subjects suggests differential expectations concerning the interpersonal dimension of a manager's leadership performance. Studies indicate, for example, that females tend to place more emphasis on working with congenial associates and establishing pleasant interpersonal relationships than males (Manhardt, 1972; Schuler, 1975; Bartol, 1976). The difference in perceptions found in this study between males and females might suggest that females expect more consideration behavior from a manager than their male counterparts do.

REFERENCES

Bartol, K. Relationship of sex and professional training area to job orientation. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1976, 61, 368-370.

Bartol, K. M. and Butterfield, D. A. Sex effects in evaluating leaders. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1976, 61, 446-454.

Collins, M., Waters, L. K. and Waters, C. W. Relationships between sex-role orientation and attitudes toward women as managers. Psychological Reports, 1979, 45, 828-830.

Eakins, B. and Eakins, R. G. Sex differences in human communication. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1978.

Haccoun, D., Haccoun, R. and Sallay, G. Sex differences in the appropriateness of supervisory styles: a non-management view. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1978, 63, 124-127.

Kanter, R. M. Men and women of the corporation. New York: Basic Books, 1977.

Mai-Dalton, R. R., Feldman-Summers, S., and Mitchell, T. R. Effect of employee gender and behavioral style on the evaluations of male and female banking executives. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1979, 64, 221-226.

Manhardt, P. Job orientation of male and female college graduates in business. Personnel Psychology, 1972, 25, 361-368.

Remland, M. Leadership behavior and nonverbal displays of status in a dyadic interaction. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Southern Illinois University, 1981.

Remland, M., DeWine, S., Jacobson, C., and Jones, T. Evaluations of out-of-role implicit behavior for male and female managers. Resources in Education, June, 1982.

Rosen, B., and Jerdee, T. H. The influence of sex-role stereotypes on evaluations of male and female supervisory behavior. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1973, 57, 44-48.

Schuler, R. Sex, organizational level and outcome importance: where the differences are. Personnel Psychology, 1975, 28, 365-375.

Sharp, C. and Post, R. Evaluation of male and female applicants for sex congruent and sex incongruent jobs. Sex Roles, 1980, 6 (3), 391-401.

Spence, J. T. and Helmreich, R. L. Masculinity and femininity: their psychological dimensions, correlates and antecedents. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1978.

Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R. and Stapp, J. The personal attributes questionnaire: a measure of sex role stereotypes and masculinity-femininity. Ms. 617, American Psychological Association, 1974.

Tepper, D. T. and Haase, R. F. Verbal and nonverbal communication of facilitative conditions. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1978, 25 (1), 35-44.

Terborg, J. R. and Ilgen, D. R. A theoretical approach to sex discrimination in traditionally masculine occupations. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1977, 13, 352-376.

Welsh, M. C. Attitudinal measures and evaluation of males and females in leadership roles. Psychological Reports, 1979, 45, 19-22.

Table 1

Factor Loadings for Leadership Ratings
(N=289)

Scale Item	Factor 1 Consideration	Factor 2 Task Behavior
Practical - Impractical**	.49	.53
Unclear - Clear *	.20	.60
Well-planned - Poorly planned **	.58	.50
Sensitive to employee's feelings - Insensitive to employee's feelings **	.47	.53
Lowering employee's confidence - Raising employee's confidence *	.80	.20
Inefficient - Efficient *	.39	.64
Concerned with employee's approval - Not concerned with employee's approval	.80	.25
Degrading - Upgrading *	.83	.25
Organized - Unorganized	.12	.77
Boosting employee's ego Damaging employee's ego	.68	.39
Treating like an inferior - Treating like a superior *	.83	.23
Concerned with detail - Unconcerned with detail	.20	.70
Recognizing value of employee - Ignoring value of employee	.22	.57
Well-coordinated - Not coordinated **	.57	.59
Poor - Excellent *	.74	.26
Appropriate - Inappropriate	.63	.32
Effective - Ineffective **	.58	.59
Unsuccessful - Successful**	.59	.48

* Item reversed for scoring.
** Items not retained for subsequent analysis.

Table 2

Univariate Analyses of Variance

Source	df	MS	F	p	R^2
Task Behavior					
Manager's Nonverbal	2	5175.50	74.50	.0001	.33
Subject's Sex	1	816.27	11.75	.0007	.03
Error	285	69.47			
Total	288				
Consideration					
Manager's Nonverbal	2	444.97	20.61	.0001	.13
Subject's Sex	1	56.61	2.62		
Error	258	21.59			
Total	288				

Table 3

Ratings on Leadership Rating Form
(N = 289)

Variable	Consideration		Task Behavior	
	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
Manager's Non-verbal				
Supportive - Supportive	34.71	7.34	21.23	4.48
Non-supportive - Non-supportive	20.68	8.89	17.20	5.39
Supportive - Non-supportive	32.86	9.13	20.89	4.17
Personal Attributes Questionnaire				
Androgynous	30.51	11.12	19.78	5.86
Sex-typed	30.00	10.10	20.23	3.96
Undifferentiated	29.45	9.88	19.93	4.56
Managers' Sex				
Male	30.11	10.60	20.29	4.66
Female	29.82	10.21	19.65	5.20
Subjects' Sex				
Male	31.58	9.46	20.37	4.35
Female	28.43	10.96	19.53	5.46